



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,638	08/09/2001	Allison J. Tanner	D-16699	4427

7590 05/23/2003  
Tom Beall, Esq.  
Corning Incorporated  
SP-TI-03-1  
Corning, NY 14831

EXAMINER

NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,638

Applicant(s)

TANNER ET AL.

Examiner

Patricia L. Nordmeyer

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 4,8-10,12 and 24 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 13-23 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Withdrawn Rejections***

1. The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claim 12 of record in Paper #4, Page 2, Paragraph #3 has been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment in Paper #5.
2. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 11 and 12 of record in Paper #4, Pages 3 - 4, Paragraph #5 has been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment in Paper #5.
3. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 5 and 10 of record in Paper #4, Pages 3 - 4, Paragraph #5 has been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment in Paper #5.

### ***New Rejections***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shukla et al. (USPN 6,458,275) in view of Thurn et al. (USPN 4,076,550).

Shukla et al discloses a multiwell plate (Column 2, lines 30 - 32) where the sidewalls of

Art Unit: 1772

the wells are formed from a polymeric material such as polystyrene (Column 2, lines 34 – 36) and the closure mat that forms the bottom wall of the wells is made from an inorganic material such as glass (Column 2, lines 40 – 44). The closure mat is attached to the wells through an adhesive strip, sheet or layer (Column 3, lines 8 – 9). However, Shukla et al. fails to disclose the glass being a pyrolyzed glass, an additive that is mixed with the adhesive that interacts with the adhesive, frame and layer in a manner which strengthens a bond between said frame and said layer, the additive being a silane monomer and the additive being 3-(trimethoxysilyl)propyl methacrylate.

Thurn et al. teaches a silane additive, which is chosen from a variety of compounds including 3-(trimethoxysilyl)propyl methacrylate (Column 5, line 47 to Column 6, line 28), combined with a resin (Column 1, lines 51 – 53) for the purpose of promoting adhesion between different materials including glass and polystyrene (Column 1, lines 46 – 50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the chosen silane additive mixed with the adhesive material in Shukla et al. in order to promote adhesion between different materials including glass and polystyrene as taught by Thurn et al.

Shukla et al., as modified with Thurn et al., discloses the claimed invention except for the glass being pyrolyzed glass. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use pyrolyzed glass, since it has been held to be within the

Art Unit: 1772

general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

6. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shukla et al. (USPN 6,458,275) in view of Thurn et al. (USPN 4,076,550) as applied to claims 1 – 3, 6 and 7 above, and further in view of Perlman (USPN 5,858,770).

Shukla et al., as modified with Thurn et al., discloses the claimed multiwell plate formed from polystyrene and glass which is attached by an adhesive containing a silane monomer additive. However, Shukla et al. in view of Thurn et al. fails to disclose the adhesive being a non-cytotoxic adhesive.

Perlman teaches a non-cytotoxic pressure sensitive acrylic adhesive material (Column 10, lines 4 – 6) on a sealing membrane for a cell culture plate (Column 9, lines 5 – 13) for the purpose of maintaining a sterile environment in the cell culture (Column 7, lines 27 – 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided non-cytotoxic adhesive in Shukla et al. in order to maintain a sterile environment in the cell culture as taught by Perlman.

Art Unit: 1772

7. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shukla et al. (USPN 6,458,275) in view of Thurn et al. (USPN 4,076,550) as applied to claims 1 – 3, 6 and 7 above, and further in view of Merz et al. (USPN 4,871,590).

Shukla et al., as modified with Thurn et al., discloses the claimed multiwell plate formed from polystyrene and glass which is attached by an adhesive containing a silane monomer additive. However, Shukla et al. in view of Thurn et al. fails to disclose the adhesive containing a 3-(mercaptopropyl)trimethoxy silane additive.

Merz et al. teach a 3-(mercaptopropyl)trimethoxy silane additive (Column 4, line 30) in a hot melt adhesive (Column 3, lines 17 – 18) for the purpose of forming a moldable adhesive that quickly solidifies.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the 3-(mercaptopropyl)trimethoxy silane additive in the modified Shukla et al. in order to form a moldable adhesive that quickly solidifies as taught by Merz et al.

8. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shukla et al. (USPN 6,458,275) in view of Thurn et al. (USPN 4,076,550) as applied to claims 1 – 3, 6 and 7 above, and further in view of Perlman (USPN 5,858,770).

Shukla et al., as modified with Thurn et al., discloses the claimed multiwell plate formed from polystyrene and glass which is attached by an adhesive containing a silane monomer additive. However, Shukla et al. in view of Thurn et al. fails to disclose the adhesive containing a tris2-(methoxyethoxy)vinyl silane additive.

Boyce et al. teach a tris2-(methoxyethoxy)vinyl silane additive (Column 7, line 6) in a hot melt adhesive (Column 1, lines 12 – 13) for the purpose of forming an adhesive that is stable at high temperatures.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided tris2-(methoxyethoxy)vinyl silane additive in the modified Shukla et al. in order to form a moldable adhesive that quickly solidifies as taught by Boyce et al.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 10 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, since the combination of Shukla et al. and Thurn et al. is being maintained in the above rejection, the arguments will be addressed below.

In response to applicant's argument that Thurn et al. is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be

Art Unit: 1772

reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Thurn et al. disclose a reinforcing additive in an adhesive used to adhere glass and polystyrene which is pertinent to an adhesive problem of attaching the polymeric material and glass of the claimed invention.

### ***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (703) 306-



Art Unit: 1772


5480. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 7:00-4:30 & alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (703) 308-4251. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Patricia L. Nordmeyer  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1772

*pln*  
pln  
May 21, 2003

  
HAROLD PYON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
*1772*

*5/21/03*